

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 14 2006

**Yee &
Associates, P.C.**4100 Alpha Road
Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75244Main No. (972) 385-8777
Facsimile (972) 385-7766**Facsimile Cover Sheet**

To: Commissioner for Patents for Examiner Lalita M. Hamilton Group Art Unit 3624	Facsimile No.: 571/273-8300
From: Michele Morrow Legal Assistant to Francis Lammes	No. of Pages Including Cover Sheet: 31
Message: Enclosed herewith: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transmittal Document; and• Appeal Brief.	
Re: Application No. 09/753,964 Attorney Docket No: RSW9-2000-0103-US1	
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2006	
Please contact us at (972) 385-8777 if you do not receive all pages indicated above or experience any difficulty in receiving this facsimile.	<i>This Facsimile is intended only for the use of the addressee and, if the addressee is a client or their agent, contains privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this facsimile, you have received this facsimile inadvertently and in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone and return the facsimile to us immediately.</i>

**PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS TRANSMISSION BY
FAXING A CONFIRMATION TO 972-385-7766.**

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 14 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Boubez et al.

Serial No.: 09/753,964

Filed: January 3, 2001

For: Apparatus and Method for
Verifying Categorization of Services
Using Canonical Service Description
Tests

36736

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER

§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 3624

Examiner: Hamilton, Lalita M.

Attorney Docket No.: RSW9-2000-0103-US1

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to
the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-
1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on February 14, 2006.

By:


Michele MorrowTRANSMITTAL DOCUMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

ENCLOSED HEREWITH:

- Appeal Brief (37 C.F.R. 41.37).

A fee of \$500.00 is required for filing an Appeal Brief. Please charge this fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0461. No additional fees are believed to be necessary. If, however, any additional fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0461. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis Lammes

Registration No. 55,353

Agent for Applicants

Duke W. Yee

Registration No. 34,285

Attorney for Applicants

YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

P.O. Box 802333

Dallas, Texas 75380

(972) 385-8777

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 14 2006

Docket No. RSW9-2000-0103-US1

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Boubez et al.

Serial No. 09/753,964

Filed: January 3, 2001

For: Apparatus and Method for
Verifying Categorization of Services
Using Canonical Service Description
Tests

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 3624

Examiner: Hamilton, Lalita M.

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via
facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300
on February 14, 2006.

By:


Michele Morrow

02/16/2006 LWONDIM1 00000007 090461 09753964

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.37)

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on January 3, 2006.

The fees required under § 41.20(B)(2), and any required petition for extension of time for filing this
brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL
BRIEF.

(Appeal Brief Page 1 of 29)
Boubez et al. - 09/753,964

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines Corporation.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

With respect to other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no such appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS**A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION**

Claims in the application are: 1-30.

B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims canceled: NONE.
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: NONE.
3. Claims pending: 1-30.
4. Claims allowed: NONE.
5. Claims rejected: 1-30.
6. Claims objected to: NONE.

C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-30.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

There are no amendments after the final rejection.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER***Independent claims 1, 11, and 21:***

The present invention provides a method in a data processing system of verifying a categorization of a service in a taxonomy. (Specification, page 23, lines 28-30) The present invention receives a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered. (Specification, page 23, lines 30-32) The present invention applies one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category. (Specification, page 23, line 32, to page 24, line 7) The present invention registers the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category. (Specification, page 24, lines 7-12)

The receiving, applying, and registering means recited in independent claim 21, as well as dependent claims 22-24 and 27, may be data processing hardware within server 104 or clients 108, 110, and 112 in Figure 1 operating under control of software such as the exemplary software shown in Figure 5 executed by processor 302 of Figure 3 and performing the steps described in the specification at page 23, line 28, to page 24, line 21, or equivalent. The determining means recited in claim 25 may be data processing hardware within server 104 or clients 108, 110, and 112 in Figure 1 operating under control of software such as the exemplary software shown in Figure 5 executed by processor 302 of Figure 3 and performing the steps described in the specification at page 23, line 28, to page 24, line 21, or equivalent. The determining means recited in claim 26 may be data processing hardware within server 104 or clients 108, 110, and 112 in Figure 1 operating under control of software such as the exemplary software shown in Figure 5 executed by processor 302 of Figure 3 and performing the steps described in the specification at page 23, line 28, to page 24, line 21, or equivalent. The searching and registering means recited in claim 28, as well as dependent claims 29 and 30, may be data processing hardware within server 104 or clients 108, 110, and 112 in Figure 1 operating

under control of software such as the exemplary software shown in Figure 5 executed by processor 302 of Figure 3 and performing the steps described in the specification at page 23, line 28, to page 24, line 21, or equivalent. A person having ordinary skill in the art would be able to derive computer instructions on a computer readable medium as recited in claim 11, as well as dependent claims 12-20 given Figure 4 and the corresponding description at page 11, line 1, to page 12, line 20, or equivalent, without undue experimentation.

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**A. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 1-30)**

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Poon (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0062265).

(Appeal Brief Page 8 of 29)
Boubez et al. - 09/753,964

ARGUMENT

A. Claims 1-30

The Examiner rejects claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Poon (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0062265 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A.1. Claims 1, 11, and 21

As to claims 1, 11 and 21, the Examiner states:

Poon discloses a method and corresponding apparatus with means and computer program product with instructions for facilitating user selection of an item category in an online auction comprising receiving a registration request, the registration request including a service description and an identification of category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered, applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category, and registering the service description in the identified category if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category (p. 49, 26-32); one or more canonical service description tests identify minimum criteria for the category (p. 49, 26-32); registering the service description in the category includes storing the service description and an associated model description in a storage association with the category (p. 49, 26-32); implementation in a service broker within at least one network (p. 49, 26-32); if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category, a determination is made as to whether a request to add a new category is received (p. 49, 26-32); if a request to add a new category is received, a determination is made as to whether to add the new category, and wherein if the new category is added, the service description is registered in association with the new category (p. 49, 26-32); one or more canonical service description tests include information identifying minimum requirements of the category regarding one or more of security requirements, privacy requirements and communication protocol requirements (p. 49, 26-32); if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be not registered in the category, searching the taxonomy for an alternate category in which the service description should be registered and registering the service description in the alternate category (p. 49, 26-32); searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes searching one or more of sibling, parent and child categories of the identified category within a predetermined

range of the identified category in the taxonomy (p. 49, 26-32); and searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes searching the taxonomy for a category in which the service description meets requirements of a canonical service description test associated with the alternate category (p. 49, 26-32).

Office Action dated June 7, 2005, pages 2-4.

Claim 1 is a representative claim from the rejected claims reads as follows:

1. A method in a data processing system of verifying a categorization of a service in a taxonomy, comprising:
 - receiving a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered;
 - applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category; and
 - registering the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Appellants respectfully submit that Poon does not teach every element of the claimed invention arranged as they are in the claims. Specifically, Poon does not teach receiving a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered, applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category, and registering the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category.

(Appeal Brief Page 10 of 29)
Boubez et al. - 09/753,964

Poon is directed to a system for facilitating category selection by a user in a computerized auction. In the Poon system, a category field is provided, containing a plurality of category entries used to categorize an item in the auction. A client selects one category entry in a category field and a server provides at least one subcategory field. A plurality of subcategory entries is used to categorize the item in the auction, the subcategory entries corresponding to the user selected category entry of the plurality of category entries. At least one subcategory entry corresponding to the one selected category entry is further selected in the at least one subcategory field for further processing.

Thus, in the Poon system a user selects a category entry from a plurality of categories, and the server responds with a list of subcategories for the user selected category. This process continues until there are no further subcategories and then the final selected category is used for item registration. The Examiner alleges that Poon teaches receiving a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a **service description** and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered in paragraphs [0026]-[0032]. In this rather lengthy section, Poon merely receives a selection of a category from a user, determines if there are subcategories associated with the received category, and responds to the user with the subcategories if subcategories exist for the selected category. Thus, Poon fails to teach receiving a registration request that includes a **service description** and an identification of a category. The request sent from the client merely contains a selection of a category.

In the Office Action dated November 16, 2005, the Examiner states:

In response, Poon discloses receiving a registration request at a data processing system (p.50, 29 – user has option to proceed with category registration request if the category does not exist), the registration request including a **service description** and an identification of category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered (p.50, 29); applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category, and registering the service description in the identified category if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category (p.50, 29 – a test of whether the subcategory has related subcategories is performed, and if it does not exist, the user has the option to register the subcategory); one or more canonical service description tests identify minimum criteria for the category (p.50, 29 – a test of whether the subcategory has related subcategories is performed, and if it does not exist, the user has the

(Appeal Brief Page 11 of 29)
Boubez et al. – 09/753,964

option to register the subcategory); storing the service description and an associated model description in a storage association with the category (p. 50, 29); storing at the server any information from the client (p.50, 28-29—it is inherent that the server will store the client's information during the process); a service broker (p.50, 28-29—system broker); if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category, a determination is made as to whether a request to add a new category is received, or registering the service description in the alternate category (p.50, 29—category added if it does not exist); applying a canonical service description test that identifies minimum requirements of the category using security requirements, privacy requirements, and communication protocol requirements (p.50, 29—inherent that the system will utilize security requirements, privacy requirements and communication protocol to protect the user); and searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes searching one or more of sibling, parent and child categories of the identified category within a predetermined range of the identified category in the taxonomy (p.50, 28-29—searched categories, subcategories, and the subcategories of the subcategories).

The section of Poon that allegedly teaches receiving a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered, reads as follows:

FIG. 4 shows a flowchart representing the process of selecting an item category in an online auction from a user's perspective. Referring to FIG. 4, in one embodiment, the client browser 336 within the client application 332 receives category hierarchy data from the server application 312 at step 405. The category hierarchy data includes category and subcategory information. Using the category data, the client browser 336 performs the category selection process as follows. Once the user is ready to select an item category, at step 410, a decision is made whether a category number is available to the user. If the user has previously selected the same category and subcategories and has stored the category number associated with the category and the respective subcategories, the user enters the category number at step 420. As a result, based on the category number, the respective category and related subcategories are selected and displayed by the client browser 336 in the respective fields.

If the category number or numeric I.D. is not available, then, at step 430, the user selects a category from a list of available categories displayed in an interactive category area. Next, the client browser 336 performs a test whether the selected category has related subcategories at step 440. If the selected category has no related subcategories, then the user has the option to record the category number of the selected category at step 445 and may proceed further with the item registration process. Alternatively, if related subcategories exist, the user selects a subcategory from a list of available subcategories related to the selected category at step 450. The list of available subcategories is displayed in an interactive area

adjacent to the category area. A test whether the subcategory has no further related subcategories is performed by the client browser at step 460. If no further related subcategories exist, then the user may record the category number of the selected combination of category and subcategory at step 470 and proceed further with the item registration process. Otherwise, if further subcategories related to the selected subcategory are still available, the user goes back to step 450 and repeats the subcategory selection process. The embodiment described above allows the client browser 336 to perform the category selection process using category data and Javascript code supplied by the server application 312. Alternatively, the server application 312 may interact with the user during the selection process and may perform other functions as described in further detail below.

(Page 50, paragraphs [0028]-[0029])

In this section, Poon describes the user selecting a category from a list of categories. If the selected category has subcategories, the user is able to select from the subcategories. The process of Poon repeats until there are no underlying subcategories. This process is initiated based on a decision whether a category number is available to the user. The missing category number that starts the process enables the user to select the associated category and subcategories **without going through the entire selection process**. Thus, while the selection of a category may be a request, the request does not include a **service description** and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered.

Additionally, Poon fails to teach applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category. The server of Poon merely determines if there are related subcategories associated with the category selection received from the user. Nowhere in Poon is a test applied to a service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category as there is no service description received from the client in the Poon system. The Examiner relies on page 50, paragraph [0029], shown above, as teaching this feature and the Examiner alleges a test is performed of whether the subcategory has related subcategories, and if it does not exist, the user has the option to register the subcategory. Appellants respectfully submit that determining of a category has related subcategories are not equivalent to applying canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category.

Furthermore, Poon does not teach registering the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category. As discussed previously, Poon merely receives a category selection and does not apply one or more canonical service description tests to determine that the service description should be registered in the identified category. Poon relies on the user to determine what category the item should be listed in.

Thus, Poon does not teach each and every feature of independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as is required under 35 U.S.C. § 102. At least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 11, and 21, the specific features of dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30 are not taught by Poon. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

Furthermore, Poon does not teach, suggest or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention. Absent the Examiner pointing out some teaching or incentive to implement Poon such that a registration request is received at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered, one or more canonical service description tests are applied to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category, and the service description is registered in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to modify Poon to reach the present invention when the reference is examined as a whole. Absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive to modify Poon in this manner, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an improper use of hindsight using the Appellants' disclosure as a template to make the necessary changes to reach the claimed invention.

A.2. Claims 2, 12, and 22

With regard to claims 2, 12 and 22, Poon does not teach wherein the one or more canonical service description tests identify minimum criteria for the category. As discussed previously the only test applied by Poon is whether the user selected category has related subcategories. There is no test applied by Poon that identifies minimum criteria for the selected category. The Examiner alleges that this feature is taught at page 50, paragraph 29, shown above, and the Examiner further alleges that a test of whether the subcategory has related subcategories is performed, and if it does not exist, the user has the option to register the subcategory. Appellants respectfully submit that, determining of a category has related subcategories are not equivalent to applying canonical service description tests that identify minimum criteria for the category. The user of Poon is the person making the decision as to what category is selected, there is no test performed by Poon that verified the description of the item fits within the category selected by the user.

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 2, 12, and 22. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 12, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.3. Claims 3, 13, and 23

With regard to claims 3, 13, and 23, Poon does not teach wherein registering the service description in the category includes storing the service description and an associated model description in a storage in association with the category. In the Poon reference only the final selected category that has no subcategories is recorded by the user. Poon does not provide for storing at the server any information from the client. Moreover, Poon does not receive a service description or an associated model description. The Examiner alleges that this feature is taught at page 50, paragraphs 28-29, shown above, and the Examiner further alleges that it is inherent that the server will store the client's information during the process. Appellants respectfully submit that Poon does not store the service description and an associated model description in a

storage in association with the category as the user of Poon never provides this information. The user of Poon merely selects categories and subcategories.

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 3, 13, and 23. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3, 13, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.4. Claims 4, 14, and 24

With regard to claim 4, 14, and 24, Poon does not teach wherein the method is implemented in a service broker within at least one network. While Poon may mention a network, nowhere in the Poon reference is a service broker even mentioned. The Examiner alleges that this feature is taught at page 50, paragraphs 28-29, shown above. In this section, Poon describes a selection device. Appellants respectfully submit that a selection device is not a service broker.

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 4, 14, and 24. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4, 14, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.5. Claims 5, 15, and 25

With regard to claim 5, 15, and 25, Poon does not teach wherein if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category, a determination is made as to whether a request to add a new category is received. Poon merely teaches the server determining whether the user selected category has related subcategories. Nowhere in Poon is the addition of a new category mentioned. The Examiner alleges that this feature is taught at page 50, paragraph 29, shown above, and the Examiner further alleges that the category is added if it does not exist. There is no support whatsoever in the Poon reference for adding a category, thus, the Examiner's allegation is incorrect. Poon actually teaches that if further subcategories related to the selected subcategory

are still available, the user goes back to step 450 and repeats the subcategory selection process (see paragraph [0029]).

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 5, 15, and 25. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5, 15, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.6. Claims 6, 16, and 26

With regard to claim 6, 16, and 26, Poon does not teach wherein if a request to add a new category is received, a determination is made as to whether to add the new category, and wherein if the new category is added, the service description is registered in association with the new category. As discussed previously, Poon does not teach the addition of a new category and does not teach service descriptions. Furthermore, Poon does not teach registering a service description in association with a new category.

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 6, 16, and 26. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6, 16, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.7. Claims 7, 17, and 27

With regard to claim 7, 17, and 27, Poon does not teach wherein the one or more canonical service description tests include information identifying minimum requirements of the category regarding one or more of security requirements, privacy requirements and communication protocol requirements. Poon does not teach receiving service descriptions for the item for which the user selects a category. Thus, Poon does not teach applying a canonical service description test that identifies minimum requirements of the category using security requirements, privacy requirements, and communication protocol requirements. The Examiner alleges that this feature is taught at page 50, paragraph 29, shown above, and the Examiner further alleges that it is inherent that the system will utilize security requirements, privacy requirements and communication protocol to protect the user. Nowhere in any section of the

Poon reference are security requirements, privacy requirements, or communication protocol with regard to identifying minimum requirements of the category taught or discussed. Again, the Examiner's allegation is not supported by the teaching of Poon.

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 7, 17, and 27. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7, 17, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.8. Claims 8, 18, and 28

With regard to claim 8, 18, and 28, Poon does not teach wherein if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category, the method further comprises: searching the taxonomy for an alternate category in which the service description should be registered; and registering the service description in the alternate category. As discussed previously, Poon does not apply a canonical service description test and does not determine whether a service description should be registered within a specific category. Poon teaches determining whether the user selected category has related subcategories. Moreover, Poon does not teach or provide for searching for an alternate category in which the service description should be registered or registering the service description in the alternate category. Poon simply is not relevant to the present claimed invention.

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 8, 18, and 28. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8, 18, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.9. Claims 9, 19, and 29

With regard to claim 9, 19, and 29, Poon does not teach wherein searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes searching one or more of sibling, parent and child categories of the identified category within a predetermined range of the identified category in the taxonomy. Nowhere in Poon is there a teaching of searching for an alternative category. Poon merely

returns the subcategories related to another category or subcategory for the user to select from. Poon actually teaches away from the present invention by teaching that if further subcategories related to the selected subcategory are still available, the user goes back to step 450 and repeats the subcategory selection process (see paragraph [0029]).

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 9, 19, and 29. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9, 19, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

A.10. Claims 10, 20, and 30

With regard to claim 10, 20, and 30, Poon does not teach wherein searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes searching the taxonomy for a category in which the service description meets requirements of a canonical service description test associated with the alternate category. Nowhere in Poon is there a teaching of searching for an alternative category. Again, Poon actually teaches away from the present invention by teaching that if further subcategories related to the selected subcategory are still available, the user goes back to step 450 and repeats the subcategory selection process (see paragraph [0029]).

In view of the above, Poon fails to teach the specific features recited in dependent claims 10, 20, and 30. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10, 20, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 not be sustained.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1-30 are allowable over the cited prior art and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to not sustain the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action.



Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777

CLAIMS APPENDIX

The text of the claims involved in the appeal are:

1. A method in a data processing system of verifying a categorization of a service in a taxonomy, comprising:

receiving a registration request at the data processing system, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered;

applying one or more canonical service description tests to the service description to determine if the service description should be registered in the category; and

registering the service description in the identified category using the data processing system if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein the one or more canonical service description tests identify minimum criteria for the category.
3. The method of claim 1, wherein registering the service description in the category includes storing the service description and an associated model description in a storage in association with the category.
4. The method of claim 1, wherein the method is implemented in a service broker within at least one network.

5. The method of claim 1, wherein if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category, a determination is made as to whether a request to add a new category is received.
6. The method of claim 5, wherein if a request to add a new category is received, a determination is made as to whether to add the new category, and wherein if the new category is added, the service description is registered in association with the new category.
7. The method of claim 1, wherein the one or more canonical service description tests include information identifying minimum requirements of the category regarding one or more of security requirements, privacy requirements and communication protocol requirements.
8. The method of claim 1, wherein if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category, the method further comprises:
- searching the taxonomy for an alternate category in which the service description should be registered; and
 - registering the service description in the alternate category.
9. The method of claim 8, wherein searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes searching one or more of sibling, parent and child categories of the identified category within a predetermined range of the identified category in the taxonomy.

10. The method of claim 8, wherein searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes searching the taxonomy for a category in which the service description meets requirements of a canonical service description test associated with the alternate category.

11. A computer program product in a computer readable medium for verifying a categorization of a service in a taxonomy, comprising:

first instructions for receiving a registration request, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered;

second instructions for applying one or more canonical service description tests to determine if the service description should be registered in the category; and

third instructions for registering the service description in the identified category if a result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should be registered in the identified category.

12. The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the one or more canonical service description tests identify minimum criteria for the category.

13. The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the third instructions for registering the service description in the category includes instructions for storing the service description and an associated model description in a storage in association with the category.

14. The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the computer program product is executed in a service broker within at least one network.

15. The computer program product of claim 11, further comprising fourth instructions for determining whether a request to add a new category is received, if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category.

16. The computer program product of claim 15, further comprising fifth instructions for determining whether to add the new category, if a request to add a new category is received, and sixth instructions for registering the service description in association with the new category, if the new category is added.

17. The computer program product of claim 11, wherein the one or more canonical service description tests includes information identifying minimum requirements of the category regarding one or more of security requirements, privacy requirements and communication protocol requirements.

18. The computer program product of claim 11, further comprising:
fourth instructions for searching the taxonomy for an alternate category in which the service description should be registered if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category;
and

fifth instructions for registering the service description in the alternate category if an alternate category is identified by execution of the fourth instructions.

19. The computer program product of claim 18, wherein the fourth instructions for searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes instructions for searching one or more of sibling, parent and child categories of the identified category within a predetermined range of the identified category in the taxonomy.

20. The computer program product of claim 18, wherein the fourth instructions for searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes instructions for searching the taxonomy for a category in which the service description meets requirements of a canonical service description test associated with the alternate category.

21. An apparatus for verifying a categorization of a service in a taxonomy, comprising:
means for receiving a registration request, the registration request including a service description and an identification of a category within the taxonomy in which the service is to be registered;

means for applying one or more canonical service description tests to determine if the service description should be registered in the identified category; and

means for registering the service description in the identified category if the determination is that the service description should be registered in the identified category.

22. The apparatus of claim 21, wherein the one or more canonical service description tests identifies minimum criteria for the category.
23. The apparatus of claim 21, wherein the means for registering the service description in the category includes means for storing the service description and an associated model description in a storage in association with the category.
24. The apparatus of claim 21, wherein the apparatus is part of a service broker within at least one network.
25. The apparatus of claim 21, further comprising means for determining whether a request to add a new category is received if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests is that the service description should not be registered in the category.
26. The apparatus of claim 25, further comprising means for determining whether to add the new category, if a request to add a new category is received, and means for registering the service description in association with the new category, if the new category is added.
27. The apparatus of claim 21, wherein the one or more canonical service description tests includes information identifying minimum requirements of the category regarding one or more of security requirements, privacy requirements and communication protocol requirements.

28. The apparatus of claim 21, further comprising:

means for searching the taxonomy for an alternate category in which the service description should be registered if the result of applying the one or more canonical service description tests indicates that the service description should not be registered in the category; and

means for registering the service description in the alternate category if an alternate category is identified by the means for searching.

29. The apparatus of claim 28, wherein the means for searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes means for searching one or more of sibling, parent and child categories of the identified category within a predetermined range of the identified category in the taxonomy.

30. The apparatus of claim 28, wherein the means for searching the taxonomy for an alternate category includes means for searching the taxonomy for a category in which the service description meets requirements of a canonical service description test associated with the alternate category.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence to be presented.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no related proceedings.